arXiv:1406.6805v2 [q-fin.PR] 26 Jul 2015

Credit Risk in a Geometric Arbitrage Perspective

Simone Farinelli
Core Dynamics GmbH
Scheuchzerstrasse 43
CH-8006 Zurich
Email: simone@coredynamics.ch

July 28, 2015

Abstract

Geometric Arbitrage Theory, where a generic market is modelled with a principal fibre bundle and arbitrage corresponds to its curvature, is applied to credit markets to model default risk and recovery, leading to closed form no arbitrage characterizations for corporate bonds.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Background **4**
2.1 The Classical Market Model 4
2.2 Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Primitives 7
2.3 Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Portfolios 8
2.4 Arbitrage Theory in a Differential Geometric Framework 9
2.4.1 Market Model as Principal Fibre Bundle 9
2.4.2 Numéraire as Global Section of the Bundle of Gauges . . 11
2.4.3 Cashflows as Sections of the Associated Vector Bundle . . 11
2.4.4 Stochastic Parallel Transport 12
2.4.5 Nelson $\mathcal{D}$ Differentiable Market Model 13
2.4.6 Arbitrage as Curvature 13

3 Credit Risk **16**
3.1 Classical Credit Risk Models 16
3.2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Credit Risk Model 21

4 Conclusion **26**

A Derivatives of Stochastic Processes **27**

1 Introduction

This paper utilizes a conceptual structure - called in Geometric Arbitrage Theory - to model arbitrage in credit markets. GAT embeds classical stochastic finance into a stochastic differential geometric framework to characterize arbitrage. The main contribution of this approach consists of modeling markets made of basic financial instruments together with their term structures as principal fibre bundles. Financial features of this market - like no arbitrage and equilibrium - are then characterized in terms of standard differential geometric constructions - like curvature - associated to a natural connection in this fibre bundle. Principal fibre bundle theory has been heavily exploited in theoretical physics as the language in which laws of nature can be best formulated by providing an invariant framework to describe physical systems and their dynamics. These ideas can be carried over to mathematical finance and economics. A market is a financial-economic system that can be described by an appropriate principle fibre bundle. A principle like the invariance of market laws under change of numéraire can be seen then as gauge invariance.

The fact that gauge theories are the natural language to describe economics was first proposed by Malaney and Weinstein in the context of the economic index problem ([Ma96], [We06]). Ilinski (see [Il00] and [Il01]) and Young ([Yo99]) proposed to view arbitrage as the curvature of a gauge connection, in analogy to some physical theories. Independently, Cliff and Speed ([SmSp98]) further developed Flesaker and Hughston seminal work ([FlHu96]) and utilized techniques from differential geometry (indirectly mentioned by allusive wording) to reduce the complexity of asset models before stochastic modeling.

Perhaps due to its borderline nature lying at the intersection between stochastic finance and differential geometry, there was almost no further mathematical research, and the subject, unfairly considered as an exotic topic, remained confined to econophysics, (see [FeJi07], [Mo09] and [DuFiMu00]). In [Fa14] Geometric Arbitrage Theory has been given a rigorous mathematical foundation utilizing the formal background of stochastic differential geometry as in Schwartz ([Schw80]), Elworthy ([El82]), Eméry([Em89]), Hackenbroch and Thalmaier ([HaTh94]), Stroock ([St00]) and Hsu ([Hs02]). GAT can bring new insights to mathematical finance by looking at the same concepts from a different perspective, so that the new results can be understood without stochastic differential geometric background. This is the case for the main contributions of this paper, a no arbitrage characterization of credit markets.

More precisely, we assume that there is a market in one currency for both government and corporate bonds for different maturities and we choose the government bond as numéraire. We assume that the deflators (i.e. the risk free discounted values) of the corporate and government bond dynamics follows the SDEs

$$\begin{aligned} dD_t^{\text{Corp}} &= D_t^{\text{Corp}}(\alpha_t^{\text{Corp}}dt + \sigma_t^{\text{Corp}}dW_t) \\ dD_t^{\text{Gov}} &= D_t^{\text{Gov}}(\alpha_t^{\text{Gov}}dt + \sigma_t^{\text{Gov}}dW_t), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where

- $(W_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ is a standard P-Brownian motion in $\mathbf{R}^K$, for some $K \in \mathbf{N}$, and,
- $(\sigma_t^{\text{Corp/Gov}})_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$, $(\alpha_t^{\text{Corp/Gov}})_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ are $\mathbf{R}^K$-, and respectively, $\mathbf{R}$- valued locally bounded predictable stochastic processes,

With the formal notation introduced in subsection 3.2 we will prove following results.

Theorem 1 (**No Arbitrage Credit Market**). *Let $\lambda = \lambda_t$ and $\text{LGD} = \text{LGD}_t$ be the default intensity and the Loss-Given-Default, respectively, of the corporate bond. Let $P^{Corp,\ Gov}$ and $r^{Corp,\ Gov}$ be the term structures and short rate for corporate and government bonds. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) The credit market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.

(ii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all times the condition

$$r_t^{Corp} - r_t^{Gov} = \beta_t \,\text{LGD}_t\, \lambda_t. \tag{2}$$

(iii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that deflators and term structures satisfy for all times the condition

$$P_{t,s}^{Corp} D_t^{Corp} - P_{t,s}^{Gov} D_t^{Gov} = -\beta_t \,\text{LGD}_t\, \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(-\int_t^s dh\lambda_h\right)\right]. \tag{3}$$

This characterization has been known for a long time (see f.i. [Schö00], page 39) and can be now easily infered as a consequence of Geometric Arbitrage Theory. Moreover, we obtain what to our knowledge is a new result for credit markets.

Theorem 2 (**Novikov's Condition**). *Let the credit market fullfill*

$$r_t^{Corp} - r_t^{Gov} = \beta_t \,\text{LGD}_t\, \lambda_t, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp\left(\left(\frac{2\,\text{LGD}_\tau}{2-\text{LGD}_\tau}\right)^2 \frac{\tau}{Q_\tau^2(K)}\right)\right] < +\infty, \tag{5}$$

where

$$Q_t^2(K) := \sqrt{\frac{W_t^\dagger W_t}{t}} \tag{6}$$

Then, the credit market satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing risk.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews classical stochastic finance and Geometric Arbitrage Theory. Arbitrage is seen as curvature of a principal fibre bundle representing the market which defines the quantity of arbitrage associated to it. A guiding example is provided for a market whose asset prices are Itô processes. Proof are omitted and can be found in [Fa14]. Section 3 reviews the fundamentals of credit risk and introduces the two basic model types, the structural and the reduced form (intensity based) ones. The results of Geometric Arbitrage Theory are then applied to prove characterizations for arbitrage free no arbitrage credit markets. Section 4 concludes.

2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Background

In this section we explain the main concepts of Geometric Arbitrage Theory introduced in [Fa14], to which we refer for proofs and examples. It can be considered as the GAT reformulation of market risk.

2.1 The Classical Market Model

In this subsection we will summarize the classical set up, which will be rephrased in section (2.4) in differential geometric terms. We basically follow [HuKe04] and the ultimate reference [DeSc08].

We assume continuous time trading and that the set of trading dates is $[0, +\infty[$. This assumption is general enough to embed the cases of finite and infinite discrete times as well as the one with a finite horizon in continuous time. Note that while it is true that in the real world trading occurs at discrete times only, these are not known a priori and can be virtually any points in the time continuum. This motivates the technical effort of continuous time stochastic finance.

The uncertainty is modelled by a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathbb{P}$ is the statistical (physical) probability measure, $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t\}_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ an increasing family of sub-σ-algebras of $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space. The filtration $\mathcal{A}$ is assumed to satisfy the usual conditions, that is

- right continuity: $\mathcal{A}_t = \bigcap_{s>t} \mathcal{A}_s$ for all $t \in [0, +\infty[$.
- $\mathcal{A}_0$ contains all null sets of $\mathcal{A}_\infty$.

The market consists of finitely many **assets** indexed by $j = 1, \ldots, N$, whose **nominal prices** are given by the vector valued semimartingale $S : [0, +\infty[\times\Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$ denoted by $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{A}$. The stochastic process $(S^j_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ describes the price at time t of the jth asset in terms of unit of cash *at time* $t = 0$. More precisely, we assume the existence of a 0th asset, the **cash**, a strictly positive semimartingale, which evolves according to $S^0_t = \exp(\int_0^t du\, r^0_u)$, where the predictable semimartingale $(r^0_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ represents the continuous interest rate provided by the cash account: one always knows in advance what the interest rate on the own bank account is, but this can change from time to

time. The cash account is therefore considered the locally risk less asset in contrast to the other assets, the risky ones. In the following we will mainly utilize **discounted prices**, defined as $\hat{S}_t^j := S_t^j/S_t^0$, representing the asset prices in terms of *current* unit of cash.

We remark that there is no need to assume that asset prices are positive. But, there must be at least one strictly positive asset, in our case the cash. If we want to renormalize the prices by choosing another asset instead of the cash as reference, i.e. by making it to our **numéraire**, then this asset must have a strictly positive price process. More precisely, a generic numéraire is an asset, whose nominal price is represented by a strictly positive stochastic process $(B_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$, and which is a portfolio of the original assets $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N$. The discounted prices of the original assets are then represented in terms of the numéraire by the semimartingales $\hat{S}_t^j := S_t^j/B_t$.

We assume that there are no transaction costs and that short sales are allowed. Remark that the absence of transaction costs can be a serious limitation for a realistic model. The filtration $\mathcal{A}$ is not necessarily generated by the price process $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$: other sources of information than prices are allowed. All agents have access to the same information structure, that is to the filtration $\mathcal{A}$.

A **strategy** is a predictable stochastic process $x : [0, +\infty[\times\Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$ describing the portfolio holdings. The stochastic process $(x_t^j)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ represents the number of pieces of jth asset portfolio held by the portfolio as time goes by. Remark that the Itô stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t x \cdot dS = \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u, \tag{7}$$

and the Stratonovich stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t x \circ dS := \int_0^t x \cdot dS + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t d\langle x, S\rangle = \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t d\langle x, S\rangle_u \tag{8}$$

are well defined for this choice of integrator (S) and integrand (x), as long as the strategy is **admissible**. We mean by this that x is a predictable semimartingale for which the Itô integral $\int_0^t x \cdot dS$ is a.s. t-uniformly bounded from below. Thereby, the bracket $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the quadratic covariation of two processes. In a general context strategies do not need to be semimartingales, but if we want the quadratic covariation in (8)and hence the Stratonovich integral to be well defined, we must require this additional assumption. For details about stochastic integration we refer to Appendix A in [Em89], which summarizes Chapter VII of the authoritative [DeMe80]. The portfolio value is the process $\{V_t\}_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ defined by

$$V_t := V_t^x := x_t \cdot S_t. \tag{9}$$

An admissible strategy x is said to be **self-financing** if and only if the portfolio value at time t is given by

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u. \tag{10}$$

This means that the portfolio gain is the Itô integral of the strategy with the price process as integrator: the change of portfolio value is purely due to changes of the assets' values. The self-financing condition can be rewritten in differential form as

$$dV_t = x_t \cdot dS_t. \tag{11}$$

As pointed out in [BjHu05], if we want to utilize the Stratonovich integral to rephrase the self-financing condition, while maintaining its economical interpretation (which is necessary for the subsequent constructions of mathematical finance), we write

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t x_u \circ dS_u - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t d\langle x, S\rangle_u \tag{12}$$

or, equivalently

$$dV_t = x_t \circ dS_t - \frac{1}{2} d\langle x, S\rangle_t . \tag{13}$$

An **arbitrage strategy** (or arbitrage for short) for the market model is an admissible self-financing strategy x, for which one of the following condition holds for some horizon $T > 0$:

- $P[V_0^x < 0] = 1$ and $P[V_T^x \geq 0] = 1$,
- $P[V_0^x \leq 0] = 1$ and $P[V_T^x \geq 0] = 1$ with $P[V_T^x > 0] > 0$.

In Chapter 9 of [DeSc08] the no arbitrage condition is given a topological characterization. In view of the fundamental Theorem of asset pricing, the no-arbitrage condition is substituted by a stronger condition, the so called no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk.

Definition 3. *Let $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ be a semimartingale and $(x_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ and admissible strategy. We denote by $(x\cdot S)_{+\infty} := \lim_{t\to+\infty}\int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u$, if such limit exists, and by K_0 the subset of $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, P)$ containing all such $(x\cdot S)_{+\infty}$. Then, we define*

- $C_0 := K_0 - L^0_+(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$.
- $C := C_0 \cap L^\infty_+\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$.
- $\bar{C}$*: the closure of* C *in* L^∞ *with respect to the norm topology.*

The market model satisfies

- *the* ***1st order no-arbitrage condition or no arbitrage (NA)*** *if and only if* $C \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P}) = \{0\}$, *and*
- *the* ***2nd order no-arbitrage condition or no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk (NFLVR)*** *if and only if* $\bar{C} \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P}) = \{0\}$.

Delbaen and Schachermayer proved in 1994 (see [DeSc08] Chapter 9.4, in particular the main Theorem 9.1.1)

Theorem 4 (**Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing in Continuous Time**). *Let $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ and $(\hat{S}_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ be bounded semimartingales. There is an equivalent martingale measure $\mathbb{P}^*$ for the discounted prices $\hat{S}$ if and only if the market model satisfies the (NFLVR).*

This is a generalization for continuous time of the Dalang-Morton-Willinger Theorem proved in 1990 (see [DeSc08], Chapter 6) for the discrete time case, where the (NFLVR) is relaxed to the (NA) condition. The Dalang-Morton-Willinger Theorem generalizes to arbitrary probability spaces the Harrison and Pliska Theorem (see [DeSc08], Chapter 2) which holds true in discrete time for finite probability spaces.

An equivalent alternative to the martingale measure approach for asset pricing purposes is given by the pricing kernel (state price deflator) method.

Definition 5. *Let $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ be a semimartingale describing the price process for the assets of our market model. The positive semimartingale $(\beta_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ is called **pricing kernel (or state price deflator)** for S if and only if $(\beta_t S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-martingale.*

As shown in [HuKe04] (Chapter 7, definitions 7.18, 7.47 and Theorem 7.48), the existence of a pricing kernel is equivalent to the existence of an equivalent martingale measure:

Theorem 6. *Let $(S_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ and $(\hat{S}_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ be bounded semimartingales. The process $\hat{S}$ admits an equivalent martingale measure $\mathbb{P}^*$ if and only if there is a pricing kernel β for S (or for $\hat{S}$).*

2.2 Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Primitives

We are going to introduce a more general representation of the market model introduced in section 2.1, which better suits to the arbitrage modeling task.

Definition 7. *A **gauge** is an ordered pair of two $\mathcal{A}$-adapted real valued semimartingales (D, P), where $D = (D_t)_{t\geq 0} : [0, +\infty[\times\Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ is called **deflator** and $P = (P_{t,s})_{t,s} : \mathcal{T} \times \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$, which is called **term structure**, is considered as a stochastic process with respect to the time t, termed **valuation date** and $\mathcal{T} := \{(t, s) \in [0, +\infty[^2 \,|\, s \geq t\}$. The parameter $s \geq t$ is referred as **maturity date**. The following properties must be satisfied a.s. for all t, s such that $s \geq t \geq 0$:*

(i) $P_{t,s} > 0$,

(ii) $P_{t,t} = 1$.

Remark 8. *Deflators and term structures can be considered outside the context of fixed income. An arbitrary financial instrument is mapped to a gauge (D, P) with the following economic interpretation:*

- *Deflator: D_t is the value of the financial instrument at time t expressed in terms of some numéraire. If we choose the cash account, the 0-th asset as numéraire, then we can set $D_t^j := \hat{S}_t^j = \frac{S_t^j}{S_t^0} \quad (j = 1, \dots N)$.*

- *Term structure: $P_{t,s}$ is the value at time t (expressed in units of deflator at time t) of a synthetic zero coupon bond with maturity s delivering one unit of financial instrument at time s. It represents a term structure of forward prices with respect to the chosen numéraire.*

We point out that there is no unique choice for deflators and term structures describing an asset model. For example, if a set of deflators qualifies, then we can multiply every deflator by the same positive semimartingale to obtain another suitable set of deflators. Of course term structures have to be modified accordingly. The term "deflator" is clearly inspired by actuarial mathematics. In the present context it refers to a nominal asset value up division by a strictly positive semimartingale (which can be the state price deflator if this exists and it is made to the numéraire). There is no need to assume that a deflator is a positive process. However, if we want to make an asset to our numéraire, then we have to make sure that the corresponding deflator is a strictly positive stochastic process.

2.3 Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Portfolios

We want now to introduce transforms of deflators and term structures in order to group gauges containing the same (or less) stochastic information. That for, we will consider *deterministic* linear combinations of assets modelled by the same gauge (e. g. zero bonds of the same credit quality with different maturities).

Definition 9. *Let $\pi : [0, +\infty[\longrightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a deterministic cashflow intensity (possibly generalized) function. It induces a **gauge transform** $(D, P) \mapsto \pi(D, P) := (D, P)^\pi := (D^\pi, P^\pi)$ by the formulae*

$$D_t^\pi := D_t \int_0^{+\infty} dh\, \pi_h P_{t,t+h} \qquad P_{t,s}^\pi := \frac{\int_0^{+\infty} dh\, \pi_h P_{t,s+h}}{\int_0^{+\infty} dh\, \pi_h P_{t,t+h}}. \tag{14}$$

Proposition 10. *Gauge transforms induced by cashflow vectors have the following property:*

$$((D, P)^\pi)^\nu = ((D, P)^\nu)^\pi = (D, P)^{\pi * \nu}, \tag{15}$$

where $*$ denotes the convolution product of two cashflow vectors or intensities respectively:

$$(\pi * \nu)_t := \int_0^t dh\, \pi_h \nu_{t-h}. \tag{16}$$

The convolution of two non-invertible gauge transform is non-invertible. The convolution of a non-invertible with an invertible gauge transform is non-invertible.

Definition 11. *The term structure can be written as a functional of the* ***instantaneous forward rate*** f *defined as*

$$f_{t,s} := -\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log P_{t,s}, \quad P_{t,s} = \exp\left(- \int_t^s dh f_{t,h} \right). \tag{17}$$

and

$$r_t := \lim_{s \to t^+} f_{t,s} \tag{18}$$

is termed ***short rate****.*

Remark 12. *Since $(P_{t,s})_{t,s}$ is a t-stochastic process (semimartingale) depending on a parameter $s \geq t$, the s-derivative can be defined deterministically, and the expressions above make sense pathwise in a both classical and generalized sense. In a generalized sense we will always have a $\mathcal{D}'$ derivative for any $\omega \in \Omega$; this corresponds to a classic s-continuous derivative if $P_{t,s}(\omega)$ is a C^1-function of s for any fixed $t \geq 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Remark 13. *The special choice of vanishing interest rate $r \equiv 0$ or flat term structure $P \equiv 1$ for all assets corresponds to the classical model, where only asset prices and their dynamics are relevant.*

2.4 Arbitrage Theory in a Differential Geometric Framework

Now we are in the position to rephrase the asset model presented in subsection 2.1 in terms of a natural geometric language. Given N base assets we want to construct a portfolio theory and study arbitrage and thus we cannot a priori assume the existence of a risk neutral measure or of a state price deflator. In terms of differential geometry, we will adopt the mathematician's and not the physicist's approach. The market model is seen as a principal fibre bundle of the (deflator, term structure) pairs, discounting and foreign exchange as a parallel transport, numéraire as global section of the gauge bundle, arbitrage as curvature. The no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition is proved to be equivalent to a zero curvature condition.

2.4.1 Market Model as Principal Fibre Bundle

Let us consider -in continuous time- a market with N assets and a numéraire. A general portfolio at time t is described by the vector of nominals $x \in X$, for an open set $X \subset \mathbf{R}^N$. Following Definition 7, the asset model induces for $j = 1, \ldots, N$ the gauge

$$(D^j, P^j) = ((D^j_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}, (P^j_{t,s})_{s \geq t}), \tag{19}$$

where D^j denotes the deflator and P^j the term structure. This can be written as

$$P^j_{t,s} = \exp\left(-\int_t^s f^j_{t,u} du\right), \tag{20}$$

where f^j is the instantaneous forward rate process for the j-th asset and the corresponding short rate is given by $r^j_t := \lim_{u\to 0^+} f^j_{t,u}$. For a portfolio with nominals $x \in X \subset \mathbf{R}^N$ we define

$$D^x_t := \sum_{j=1}^N x_j D^j_t \quad f^x_{t,u} := \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_j D^j_t}{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j D^j_t} f^j_{t,u} \quad P^x_{t,s} := \exp\left(-\int_t^s f^x_{t,u} du\right). \tag{21}$$

The short rate writes

$$r^x_t := \lim_{u\to 0^+} f^x_{t,u} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_j D^j_t}{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j D^j_t} r^j_t. \tag{22}$$

The image space of all possible strategies reads

$$M := \{(x,t) \in X \times [0,+\infty[\}. \tag{23}$$

In subsection 2.3 cashflow intensities and the corresponding gauge transforms were introduced. They have the structure of an Abelian semigroup

$$G := \mathcal{E}'([0,+\infty[,\mathbf{R}) = \{F \in \mathcal{D}'([0,+\infty[) \mid \mathrm{supp}(F) \subset [0,+\infty[\text{ is compact}\}, \tag{24}$$

where the semigroup operation on distributions with compact support is the convolution (see [Ho03], Chapter IV), which extends the convolution of regular functions as defined by formula (16).

Definition 14. *The **Market Fibre Bundle** is defined as the fibre bundle of gauges*

$$\mathcal{B} := \{({D^\pi}_t{}^x, {P^\pi}_{t,.}{}^x) | (x,t) \in M, \pi \in G^*\}. \tag{25}$$

The cashflow intensities defining invertible transforms constitute an Abelian group

$$G^* := \{\pi \in G | \text{ it exists } \nu \in G \text{ such that } \pi * \nu = [0]\} \subset \mathcal{E}'([0,+\infty[,\mathbf{R}). \tag{26}$$

From Proposition 10 we obtain

Theorem 15. *The market fibre bundle $\mathcal{B}$ has the structure of a G^*-principal fibre bundle given by the action*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} \times G^* &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B} \\ ((D,P),\pi) &\mapsto (D,P)^\pi = (D^\pi, P^\pi) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The group G^* acts freely and differentiably on $\mathcal{B}$ to the right.

2.4.2 Numéraire as Global Section of the Bundle of Gauges

If we want to make an arbitrary portfolio of the given assets specified by the nominal vector x^{Num} to our numéraire, we have to renormalize all deflators by an appropriate gauge transform $\pi^{\mathrm{Num},x}$ so that:

- The portfolio value is constantly over time normalized to one:

$$D_t^{x^{\mathrm{Num}},\pi^{\mathrm{Num}}} \equiv 1. \tag{28}$$

- All other assets' and portfolios' are expressed in terms of the numéraire:

$$D_t^{x,\pi^{\mathrm{Num}}} = \mathrm{FX}_t^{x\to x^{\mathrm{Num}}} := \frac{D_t^x}{D_t^{x^{\mathrm{Num}}}}. \tag{29}$$

It is easily seen that the appropriate choice for the gauge transform π^{Num} making the portfolio x^{Num} to the numéraire is given by the global section of the bundle of gauges defined by

$$\pi_t^{\mathrm{Num},x} := \mathrm{FX}_t^{x\to x^{\mathrm{Num}}}. \tag{30}$$

Of course such a gauge transform is well defined if and only if the numéraire deflator is a positive semimartingale.

2.4.3 Cashflows as Sections of the Associated Vector Bundle

By choosing the fiber $V := \mathbf{R}^{]-\infty,+\infty[}$ and the representation $\rho : G \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ induced by the gauge transform definition, and therefore satisfying the homomorphism relation $\rho(g_1 * g_2) = \rho(g_1)\rho(g_2)$, we obtain the associated vector bundle $\mathcal{V}$. Its sections represents cashflow streams - expressed in terms of the deflators - generated by portfolios of the base assets. If $v = (v_t^x)_{(x,t)\in M}$ is the *deterministic* cashflow stream, then its value at time t is equal to

- the deterministic quantity v_t^x, if the value is measured in terms of the deflator D_t^x,
- the stochastic quantity $v_t^x D_t^x$, if the value is measured in terms of the numéraire (e.g. the cash account for the choice $D_t^j := \hat{S}_t^j$ for all $j = 1,\ldots,N$).

In the general theory of principal fibre bundles, gauge transforms are bundle automorphisms preserving the group action and equal to the identity on the base space. Gauge transforms of $\mathcal{B}$ are naturally isomorphic to the sections of the bundle $\mathcal{B}$ (See Theorem 3.2.2 in [Bl81]). Since G^* is Abelian, right multiplications are gauge transforms. Hence, there is a bijective correspondence between gauge transforms and cashflow intensities admitting an inverse. This justifies the terminology introduced in Definition 9.

2.4.4 Stochastic Parallel Transport

Let us consider the projection of $\mathcal{B}$ onto M

$$\begin{aligned} p : \mathcal{B} \cong M \times G^* &\longrightarrow M \\ (x,t,g) &\mapsto (x,t) \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

and its tangential map

$$T_{(x,t,g)}p : \underbrace{T_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B}}_{\cong \mathbf{R}^N \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^{[0,+\infty[}} \longrightarrow \underbrace{T_{(x,t)}M}_{\cong \mathbf{R}^N \times \mathbf{R}.} \tag{32}$$

The vertical directions are

$$\mathcal{V}_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} := \ker\left(T_{(x,t,g)}p\right) \cong \mathbf{R}^{[0,+\infty[}, \tag{33}$$

and the horizontal ones are

$$\mathcal{H}_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} \cong \mathbf{R}^{N+1}. \tag{34}$$

A connection on $\mathcal{B}$ is a projection $T\mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}\mathcal{B}$. More precisely, the vertical projection must have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^v_{(x,t,g)} : T_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{V}_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} \\ (\delta x, \delta t, \delta g) &\mapsto (0,0,\delta g + \Gamma(x,t,g).(\delta x, \delta t)), \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

and the horizontal one must read

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^h_{(x,t,g)} : T_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{(x,t,g)}\mathcal{B} \\ (\delta x, \delta t, \delta g) &\mapsto (\delta x, \delta t, -\Gamma(x,t,g).(\delta x, \delta t)), \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

such that

$$\Pi^v + \Pi^h = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}. \tag{37}$$

Stochastic parallel transport on a principal fibre bundle along a semimartingale is a well defined construction (cf. [HaTh94], Chapter 7.4 and [Hs02] Chapter 2.3 for the frame bundle case) in terms of Stratonovic integral. Existence and uniqueness can be proved analogously to the deterministic case by formally substituting the deterministic time derivative $\frac{d}{dt}$ with the stochastic one $\mathcal{D}$ corresponding to the Stratonovich integral.

Following Ilinski's idea ([Il01]), we motivate the choice of a particular connection by the fact that it allows to encode foreign exchange and discounting as parallel transport.

Theorem 16. *With the choice of connection*

$$\Gamma(x,t,g).(\delta x, \delta t) := g\left(\frac{D_t^{\delta x}}{D_t^x} - r_t^x \delta t\right), \tag{38}$$

the parallel transport in $\mathcal{B}$ has the following financial interpretations:

- *Parallel transport along the nominal directions (x-lines) corresponds to a multiplication by an exchange rate.*
- *Parallel transport along the time direction (t-line) corresponds to a division by a stochastic discount factor.*

Recall that time derivatives needed to define the parallel transport along the time lines have to be understood in Stratonovich's sense. We see that the bundle is trivial, because it has a global trivialization, but the connection is not trivial.

2.4.5 Nelson $\mathcal{D}$ Differentiable Market Model

We continue to reformulate the classic asset model introduced in subsection 2.1 in terms of stochastic differential geometry.

Definition 17. *A **Nelson $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable market model** for N assets is described by N gauges which are Nelson $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable with respect to the time variable. More exactly, for all $t \in [0, +\infty[$ and $s \geq t$ there is an open time interval $I \ni t$ such that for the deflators $D_t := [D_t^1, \ldots, D_t^N]^\dagger$ and the term structures $P_{t,s} := [P_{t,s}^1, \ldots, P_{t,s}^N]^\dagger$, the latter seen as processes in t and parameter s, there exist a $\mathcal{D}$ t-derivative. The short rates are defined by $r_t := \lim_{s \to t^-} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log P_{ts}$.*

*A strategy is a curve $\gamma : I \to X$ in the portfolio space parameterized by the time. This means that the allocation at time t is given by the vector of nominals $x_t := \gamma(t)$. We denote by $\bar{\gamma}$ the lift of γ to M, that is $\bar{\gamma}(t) := (\gamma(t), t)$. A strategy is said to be **closed** if it represented by a closed curve. A **$\mathcal{D}$-admissible strategy** is predictable and $\mathcal{D}$-differentiable.*

In general the allocation can depend on the state of the nature i.e. $x_t = x_t(\omega)$ for $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proposition 18. *A $\mathcal{D}$-admissible strategy is self-financing if and only if*

$$\mathcal{D}(x_t \cdot D_t) = x_t \cdot \mathcal{D}D_t - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, D \rangle_t \quad \text{or} \quad \mathcal{D}x_t \cdot D_t = -\frac{1}{2} \langle x, D \rangle_t , \tag{39}$$

almost surely.

For the reminder of this paper unless otherwise stated we will deal only with $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable market models, $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable strategies, and, when necessary, with $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable state price deflators. All Itô processes are $\mathcal{D}$ differentiable, so that the class of considered admissible strategies is very large.

2.4.6 Arbitrage as Curvature

The Lie algebra of G is

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathbf{R}^{[0,+\infty[} \tag{40}$$

and therefore commutative. The $\mathfrak{g}$-valued connection 1-form writes as

$$\chi(x,t,g)(\delta x,\delta t)=\left(\frac{D_t^{\delta x}}{D_t^x}-r_t^x\delta t\right)g, \tag{41}$$

or as a linear combination of basis differential forms as

$$\chi(x,t,g)=\left(\frac{1}{D_t^x}\sum_{j=1}^{N}D_t^j dx_j-r_t^x dt\right)g. \tag{42}$$

The $\mathfrak{g}$-valued curvature 2-form is defined as

$$R:=d\chi+[\chi,\chi], \tag{43}$$

meaning by this, that for all $(x,t,g)\in\mathcal{B}$ and for all $\xi,\eta\in T_{(x,t)}M$

$$R(x,t,g)(\xi,\eta):=d\chi(x,t,g)(\xi,\eta)+[\chi(x,t,g)(\xi),\chi(x,t,g)(\eta)]. \tag{44}$$

Remark that, being the Lie algebra commutative, the Lie bracket $[\cdot,\cdot]$ vanishes. After some calculations we obtain

$$R(x,t,g)=\frac{g}{D_t^x}\sum_{j=1}^{N}D_t^j\left(r_t^x+\mathcal{D}\log(D_t^x)-r_t^j-\mathcal{D}\log(D_t^j)\right)dx_j\wedge dt, \tag{45}$$

summarized as

Proposition 19 (**Curvature Formula**). *Let R be the curvature. Then, the following quality holds:*

$$R(x,t,g)=gdt\wedge d_x\left[\mathcal{D}\log(D_t^x)+r_t^x\right]. \tag{46}$$

We can prove following results which characterizes arbitrage as curvature.

Theorem 20 (**No Arbitrage**). *The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) The market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.

(ii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta=(\beta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all portfolio nominals and all times the condition

$$r_t^x=-\mathcal{D}\log(\beta_t D_t^x). \tag{47}$$

(iii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta=(\beta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that deflators and term structures satisfy for all portfolio nominals and all times the condition

$$P_{t,s}^x=\frac{\mathbb{E}_t[\beta_s D_s^x]}{\beta_t D_t^x}. \tag{48}$$

This motivates the following definition.

Definition 21. *The market model satisfies the **0th order no-arbitrage condition or zero curvature (ZC)** if and only if the curvature vanishes a.s.*

Therefore, we have following implications relying the three different definitions of no-abitrage:

Corollary 22.

$$\underbrace{2nd\ order\ no\text{-}arbitrage}_{(NFLVR)} \Rightarrow \underbrace{1st\ order\ no\text{-}arbitrage}_{(NA)} \Rightarrow \underbrace{0th\ order\ no\text{-}arbitrage}_{(ZC)} \tag{49}$$

As an example to demonstrate how the most important geometric concepts of section 2 can be applied we consider an asset model whose dynamics is given by a multidimensional multidimensional Itô-process. Let us consider a market consisting of $N+1$ assets labeled by $j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$, where the 0-th asset is the cash account utilized as a numéraire. Therefore, as explained in the introductory subsection 2.1, it suffices to model the price dynamics of the other assets $j = 1, \ldots, N$ expressed in terms of the 0-th asset. As vector valued semimartingales for the discounted price process $\hat{S} : [0, +\infty[\times\Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$ and the short rate $r : [0, +\infty[\times\Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$, we chose the multidimensional Itô-processes given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{S}_t &= \hat{S}_t(\alpha_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t), \\ dr_t &= a_t dt + b_t dW_t, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where

- $(W_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ is a standard P-Brownian motion in $\mathbf{R}^K$, for some $K \in \mathbf{N}$, and,
- $(\sigma_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$, $(\alpha_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ are $\mathbf{R}^{N\times K}$-, and respectively, $\mathbf{R}^N$- valued locally bounded predictable stochastic processes,
- $(b_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$, $(a_t)_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ are $\mathbf{R}^{N\times L}$-, and respectively, $\mathbf{R}^N$- valued locally bounded predictable stochastic processes.

Proposition 23. *Let the dynamics of a market model be specified by (50). Then, the market model satisfies the 0th no-arbitrage condition if and only if*

$$\alpha_t - \frac{1}{2}\langle \sigma, W\rangle_t + r_t \in Range(\sigma_t). \tag{51}$$

If the volatility term is deterministic, i.e $\sigma_t(\omega) \equiv \sigma_t$, this condition becomes

$$\alpha_t + r_t \in Range(\sigma_t). \tag{52}$$

Remark 24. *In the case of the classical model, where there are no term structures (i.e. $r \equiv 0$), the condition 52 reads as $\alpha_t \in Range(\sigma_t)$.*

Proposition 25. *For the market model whose dynamics is specified by (50), the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing risk condition (no 2nd order arbitrage) is equivalent with the zero curvature condition (no 0th order arbitrage) if*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\int_0^T \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\alpha_u^x}{|\sigma_u^x|}\right)^2 du\right)\right] < +\infty, \tag{53}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^N$. *This is the* ***Novikov condition*** *for the instantaneous Sharpe Ratio* $\frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma_t}$.

3 Credit Risk

After having introduced the machinery of Geometric Arbitrage Theory we can tackle the modeling of assets' defaults and their recoveries.

3.1 Classical Credit Risk Models

Here we summarize the standard ways to model credit risk. We follow [JaPr04] and [FrSc11]. There are basically two possibilities for modeling defaults: structural model types on one hand and reduced form (intensity based) model types on the other. The difference between them can be characterized in terms of the information assumed known by the observer. Structural models assume that the observer has the same information set as the firm's manager, i.e. the complete knowledge of all firm's assets and liabilities. In most situations, this knowledge leads to a predictable default time. In contrast, reduced form models assume that the observer has the same information set as the market, i.e. an incomplete knowledge of the firm's condition. In most cases, this imperfect knowledge leads to an inaccessible default time.

As highlighted in [JaPr04] these models are not disconnected and disjoint model types as it was commonly supposed, but rather they are really the same model containing different informational assumptions. The key distinction between structural and reduced form models is not in the characteristic of the default time (predictable vs. inaccessible), but in the information set available to the observer. Indeed, structural models can be transformed into reduced form models as the information set changes and becomes less refined, from that observable by the firm's manager to that which is observed by the market.

Rather than comparing model types on the basis of their forecasting performance, the model type choice should be based on the information set available by the observer. For pricing and hedging credit risk the relevant set is the information available in the market. By contrast, if one is interested in pricing a firm's risky debt or related credit derivatives, then the reduced form models are the preferred approach.

Let us introduce the standard setup by utilizing the market model introduced in Subsection 2 to account for defaults and different information sets. Credit risk investigates an entity (corporation, bank, individual) that borrows funds,

promises to return these funds under a prespecified contractual agreement, and who may default before the funds (in their entirety) are repaid. That for, we introduce a market allowing for two kind of assets (beside the cash account), non-defaultable (e.g. government bonds) and defaultable ones (e.g. corporate bonds). We make the governemnet asset to the numéraire, i.e. $D_t^{\text{Gov}} \equiv 1$.

Definition 26 (**Information Structures**). *To model uncertainty, there are two filtrations for* $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$*:*

- ***Market Filtration:*** *This is the* $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t\}_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ *used so far for market risk, representing the information available by all market participants.*
- ***Global Filtration:*** *This is the* $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t\in[0,+\infty[}$ *representing the information available by the management of the bond issuer company.*

The global filtration is postulated to contain the market filtration. i.e. $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathcal{G}_t$ *for all* $t \geq 0$*. Unless otherwise specified conditional probabilities and expectations refer to the market filtration, i.e.* $\mathbb{P}_t[\cdot] = \mathbb{P}[\cdot|\mathcal{A}_t]$ *and* $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{A}_t]$*.*

Definition 27 (**Default and Recovery Models**). *Let* D_t^{Corp} *be the market value of a defaultable asset.*

- ***Default Indicator:***

$$X_t := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{corporate bond in default state at time } t \\ 0, & \text{corporate bond in non-default state at time } t. \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

- ***Time-To-Default:***

$$\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 | X_t = 1\}. \tag{55}$$

- ***Conditional Default Probability:***

$$p_{t,s}^{\mathcal{A}} := \mathbb{P}_t\left[\tau \leq s | \tau > t\right]. \tag{56}$$

- ***Structural Model:*** *Let* $(E_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *be the corporate equity process with default threshold* $E_{\min}$*. The structural model for default is the following specification for the default indicator:*

$$X_t := 1_{\{E_t \leq E_{\min}\}}. \tag{57}$$

  The corporate equity dynamics is observable in the market, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_t \supset \sigma\left(\{E_s | s \leq t\}\right)$*, and it is typically given by an Itô's diffusion with respect to the market filtration*

$$dE_t = E_t(\alpha_t^E(E_t) + \sigma_t^E(E_t))dW_t. \tag{58}$$

- ***Intensity Model:*** *The global filtration* $\mathcal{G}$ *contains the filtration* $\sigma\left(\{\tau, Y_s | s \leq t\}\right)$ *generated by the Time-To-Default and by a vector of state variables* Y_t*, which follows an Itô's diffusion. The default indicator is a Cox process*

induced by τ with a positive intensity process $(\lambda_t)_{t\geq 0}$, which corresponds to the following specification:

$$X_t := 1_{\{\Lambda^{-1}(E)\leq t\}}, \tag{59}$$

where $\Lambda_t := \int_0^t dh\lambda_h$ and $E \sim Exp(1)$ is an exponentially distributed random variable.

- ***Loss-Given-Default:*** *If there is default at time t, then the recovered value at time t^+ is given by $(1 - \mathrm{LGD}_t)D_{t^-}^{Corp}$. The stochastic process $(\mathrm{LGD}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is observable in the market filtration.*

Proposition 28. *The default probabilities in the two models read:*

- *Structural Model:*

$$p_{t,s}^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{P}_t\left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t \geq E_{\min}\right]. \tag{60}$$

- *Intensity Model:*

$$p_{t,s}^{\mathcal{G}} = 1 - \mathbb{E}_t\left[\exp\left(-\int_t^s dh\lambda_h\right)\right]. \tag{61}$$

A known fact about structural credit risk models is summarized by the following proposition.

Proposition 29. *In the structural models Time-To-Default is a predictable stopping time and corresponds to the first hitting time of the barrier*

$$\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 | E_t \leq E_{\min}\}. \tag{62}$$

Remark 30. *A stopping time τ is a non-negative random variable such that the event $\{\tau \leq t\} \in \mathcal{A}_t$ for every $t \geq 0$. A stopping time is predictable if there exists a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 0}$ such that τ_n is increasing with n, $\tau_n < \tau$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \tau_n = \tau$ almost surely. Intuitively, an event described by a predictable stopping time is "known" to occur "just before" it happens, since it is announced by an increasing sequence of stopping times. This is certainly the situation for structural models with respect to the market filtration. In essence, altough default is an uncertain event and thus technically a surprise, it is not a "true surprise" to the global observer, because it can be anticipated with almost certainty by watching the path of company equity value. The key characteristic of a structural model is the observability of the market information set $\mathcal{A}_t \supset \sigma(\{E_s | s \leq t\})$ and not the fact that default is predictable.*

Another known fact about reduced form credit risk models (cf. [JaPr04]) is

Proposition 31. *In the reduced form models Time-To-Default is a totally inaccessible stopping time, i.e. for every predictable stopping time S the event $\{\omega \in \Omega | \tau(\omega) = S(\omega) < +\infty\}$ vanishes almost surely.*

Now, what are the relationships between structural and reduced form models? The reason for the transformation of the default time τ from a predictable stopping time in Proposition 29 to an inaccessible stopping time in Proposition 31 is that between the time observations of the company equity value, we do not know how the equity value has evolved. Consequently, prior to our next observation, default could occur unexpectedly (as a complete surprise). If one changes the information set held by the observer from more to less information from $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathcal{A}$, then a structural model with default being a predictable stopping time can be transformed into a hazard rate model with default being an inaccessible stopping time:

$$p_{t,s} = 1 - \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(- \int_t^s du \lambda_u \right) \right] = 1 - \exp\left(- \int_t^s du h_u \right), \tag{63}$$

where h denotes the (deterministic) hazard function. Thus, the overall relevant structure is that of the two filtrations and how stopping times behave in them. The structural models play a role in the determination of the structure generating the default time. But as soon as the information available to the observer is reduced or obscured, one needs to project onto a smaller filtration, and then the default time becomes totally inaccessible, and the compensator Λ of the one jump point process $1 - X_t$ becomes the object of interest. If the compensator can be written in the form $\Lambda_t = \int_0^t dh \lambda_h$, then the process $(\lambda_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can be interpreted as the instantaneous rate of default, given the observer's information set. In that case, from Proposition 28, we derive

Proposition 32. *Structural and intensity models are related by the following relationship*

$$\lambda_t = \lim_{s \to t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log \left(1 - \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right] \right). \tag{64}$$

Proposition 33. *For both structural and reduced for credit model, if the market model satisfies the no-arbitrage-with-vanishing-risk condition, the risk free discounted value of the corporate bond reads for any $s \geq t$*

$$D_t^{Corp} = \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\left((1 - \mathrm{LGD}_\tau) 1_{\{\tau \leq s\}} + 1_{\{\tau > s\}} \right) D_s^{Corp} \right]. \tag{65}$$

Proof. Let S_t denote the value of the corporate bond and c_t its cash flow intensity. Then

$$S_t = \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh \, c_h \exp\left(- \int_t^h du \, r_u^0 \right) \right]. \tag{66}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^{\mathrm{Corp}} &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh \, c_h \exp\left(- \int_0^h du \, r_u^0 \right) \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh \, \delta(h - \tau) \left((1 - \mathrm{LGD}_h) 1_{\{h \leq s\}} + 1_{\{h < s\}} \right) D_s^{\mathrm{Corp}} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\left((1 - \mathrm{LGD}_\tau) 1_{\{\tau \leq s\}} + 1_{\{\tau > s\}} \right) D_s^{\mathrm{Corp}} \right]]. \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

□

Is it possible to characterize the model type on the basis of Nelson's differentiation property of the default indicator?

Proposition 34. *In the structural model the generalized Nelson forward derivative of the default indicator reads*

$$DX_t = \lim_{s \to t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right]. \tag{68}$$

Proof. The default probability can be developed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_t \left[1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min}\}} 1_{\{E_t > E_{\min}\}} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_t \left[1_{\{E_t > E_{\min}\}} \right]} = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min}\}} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{s \to t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right] = \\ &= \lim_{h \to 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{P}_t \left[E_{s+h} \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right] - \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right]}{h} = \\ &= \lim_{h \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{1_{\{E_{s+h} \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min}\}} - 1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min}\}}}{h} \right] = \\ &= \lim_{s \to t^+} D 1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min}\}} = DX_t, \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where Nelson's derivative D has to be understood in the generalied sense (cf. Appendix A).

□

Proposition 35. *In the intensity model the Nelson forward generalized derivative of the default indicator reads*

$$DX_t = \lambda_t. \tag{71}$$

Proof. Following Proposition 34 we have

$$\begin{aligned} DX_t &= \lim_{s \to t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t \left[E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min} \right] = \\ &= \lim_{s \to t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \right] \right) \\ &= \lim_{s \to t^+} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \lambda_s \right] = \lambda_t. \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

□

Therefore, we can conclude that

Theorem 36. *Structural models admit an intensity formulation if and only if the default indicator admits a Nelson forward derivative.*

3.2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Credit Risk Model

Now can carry out the analysis of credit markets described in Subsection 3.1 by utilizing the tools of Geometric Arbitrage Theory introduced in Section 2 and, in particular, Proposition 25.

Definition 37 (**Credit Market**). *Let* (D^{Gov}, P^{Gov}) *and* (D^{Corp}, P^{Corp}) *be the gauge corresponding to a government and, respectively, corporate, term structure. The credit gauge* (D^{Cred}, P^{Cred}) *is defined as*

- ***Deflator:*** $D_t^{Cred} := D_t^{Corp} - D_t^{Gov}$,
- ***Instantaneous Forward Rate:*** $f_{t,s}^{Cred} := f_{t,s}^{Corp} - f_{t,s}^{Gov}$,
- ***Short Rate:*** $r_t^{Cred} := \lim_{s \to t^+} f_{t,s}^{Cred}$,
- ***Term Structure:*** $P_{t,s}^{Cred} := \exp\left(-\int_t^s dh f_{t,h}^{Cred}\right)$.

The credit gauge represents all relevant information necessary to model a credit market for bonds with arbitrary maturities and of a given rating in one currency. Different ratings correspond to different credit gauges.

Proposition 38. *The credit asset gauge satisfies following properties:*

- *Deflator:*
$$D_{t^+}^{Cred} = (1 - \mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t) D_{t^-}^{Corp} - D_t^{Gov}. \tag{73}$$
- *Term Structure:*
$$P_{t,s}^{Cred} = \frac{P_{t,s}^{Corp}}{P_{t,s}^{Gov}}. \tag{74}$$

We can apply Theorem 20 to the credit market to characterize no arbitrage.

Corollary 39 (**No Arbitrage Credit Market**). *Let* $\lambda = \lambda_t$ *and* $\mathrm{LGD} = \mathrm{LGD}_t$ *be the default intensity and the Loss-Given-Default, respectively, of the corporate bond. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) The credit market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.

(ii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ *such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all times the condition*
$$r_t^{Cred} = \beta_t\, \mathrm{LGD}_t\, \lambda_t. \tag{75}$$

(iii) There exists a positive semimartingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ *such that deflators and term structures satisfy for all times the condition*
$$\left(1 - P_{t,s}^{Cred}\right) D_t^{Gov} - P_{t,s}^{Cred} D_t^{Cred} = \beta_t \frac{\mathrm{LGD}_t}{P_{t,s}^{Gov}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(-\int_t^s dh \lambda_h\right)\right], \tag{76}$$

which becomes

$$1 - \left(1 + P_{t,s}^{Cred}\right) D_t^{Cred} = \beta_t \, \mathrm{LGD}_t \, \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp\left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \right], \tag{77}$$

if we make the government asset to the numéraire (i.e. $D^{Gov} \equiv 1$, $P^{Gov} \equiv 1$ *and* $r^{Gov} \equiv 0$*).*

Theorem 1 follows directly from Corollary 39. We can now apply Proposition 25 to the credit market to find the dynamics satisfying the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.

Corollary 40. *For the market with the government bond chosen as numéraire and a corporate bond dynamics specified by the SDE*

$$dD_t^{Corp} = D_t^{Corp}(\alpha_t^{Corp} dt + \sigma_t^{Corp} dW_t), \tag{78}$$

where

- $(W_t)_{t \in [0,+\infty[}$ *is a standard* P*-Brownian motion in* $\mathbf{R}^K$*, for some* $K \in \mathbf{N}$*, and,*
- $(\sigma_t^{Corp})_{t \in [0,+\infty[}$*,* $(\alpha_t^{Corp})_{t \in [0,+\infty[}$ *are* $\mathbf{R}^K$*-, and respectively,* $\mathbf{R}$*- valued locally bounded predictable stochastic processes,*

the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing risk condition (no 2nd order arbitrage) is equivalent with the zero curvature condition (no 0th order arbitrage), i.e.

$$r_t^{Corp} = \beta_t \, \mathrm{LGD}_t \, \lambda_t, \tag{79}$$

if Novikov's condition for the instantaneous Sharpe Ratio is satisfied which is the case if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp\left(\left(\frac{2 \, \mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{2 - \mathrm{LGD}_\tau} \right)^2 \frac{\tau}{Q_\tau^2(K)} \right) \right] < +\infty, \tag{80}$$

where

$$Q_t^2(K) := \sqrt{\frac{W_t^\dagger W_t}{t}} \sim \chi^2(K), \tag{81}$$

is a chi-squared distributed real random variable.
In terms of joint density $\rho = \rho_{(\mathrm{LGD}_t, \tau, Q_t^2(K))}(l, t, q)$ *the Novikov condition reads*

$$\int_{[0,1] \times [0,+\infty[^2} d^3(l,t,q) \left\{ \rho(l,t,q) \exp\left(\left(\frac{2l}{2-l} \right)^2 \frac{t}{q} \right) \right\} < +\infty. \tag{82}$$

Theorem 2 follows from Corollary 40.

Remark 41. *We cannot use Theorem 40 to imply that a credit model with deterministic and time constant Loss-Give-Default satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk, because in this case the (sufficient) Novikov condition is not satisfied. What are the Loss-Given-Default Models satisfying the Novikov? What are the credit models satisfying the (NFLVR) condition for the credit asset dynamics (78)?*

Proof. The only thing to prove is inequality (80). On one hand

$$\begin{cases} D_t^{\text{Gov}} \equiv 1 \\ D_t^{\text{Corp}} = 1 - \text{LGD}_t \, X_t. \end{cases} \tag{83}$$

There is a slight regularity inconsistency: D_t^{Corp} admits jumps (at default time), while the dynamics 78 is continuous. To overcome this difficulty we introduce a mollifier J_ε and regularize D_t^{Corp}:

$$D_t^{\text{Corp}} = 1 - \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} J_\varepsilon * (\text{LGD}_t \, X_t). \tag{84}$$

That is the dynamics 78 can be satisfied for and small $\varepsilon > 0$ by

$$D_t^{\text{Corp},\varepsilon} = 1 - J_\varepsilon * (\text{LGD}_t \, X_t). \tag{85}$$

On the other hand, the solution of equation (78) reads

$$\begin{cases} D_t^{\text{Gov}} = D_0^{\text{Gov}} \exp\left(\displaystyle\int_0^t dh \left(\alpha_h^{\text{Gov}} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma_h^{\text{Gov}\,\dagger} \sigma_h^{\text{Gov}} \right) \right) \right) \cdot \\ \qquad \cdot \exp\left(\displaystyle\int_0^t \sigma_h^{\text{Gov}} dW_h \right) \\ D_t^{\text{Corp},\varepsilon} = D_0^{\text{Corp}} \exp\left(\displaystyle\int_0^t dh \left(\alpha_h^{\text{Corp}} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma_h^{\text{Corp}\,\dagger} \sigma_h^{\text{Corp}} \right) \right) \right) \cdot \\ \qquad \cdot \exp\left(\displaystyle\int_0^t \sigma_h^{\text{Corp}} dW_h \right). \end{cases} \tag{86}$$

By comparing deterministc and stochstic parts in equations (86) and (83) we obtain

$$\begin{cases} D_0^{\text{Gov}} = 1 \\ \alpha_h^{\text{Gov}} \equiv 0 \\ \sigma_h^{\text{Gov}} \equiv 0 \\ D_0^{\text{Corp}} = 1 \\ \alpha_h^{\text{Corp}} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\sigma_h^{\text{Corp}\,\dagger} \sigma_h^{\text{Corp}} \right) \\ \exp\left(\int_0^t \sigma_h^{\text{Corp}} dW_h \right) = 1 - J_\varepsilon * (\text{LGD}_t \, X_t). \end{cases} \tag{87}$$

Taking Nelson mean derivative on both side of the last equation, and taking into account that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}\int_0^t \sigma_h^{\mathrm{Corp}} dW_h = \sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}} \mathcal{D}W_t - \frac{1}{2}\underbrace{\langle \sigma^{\mathrm{Corp}}, W\rangle_t}_{=0} \\ \mathcal{D}W_t = \frac{W_t}{2t}, \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

leads to

$$\sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}} = -2t\frac{\mathcal{D}(J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t))}{1 - J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t)} W_t^\dagger \left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-1}. \tag{89}$$

Now we can compute the Sharpe ratio for any portfolio $x = [x^{\mathrm{Gov}}, x^{\mathrm{Corp}}]^\dagger$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\alpha_t^x}{|\sigma_t^x|}\right)^2 = \frac{x^\dagger \alpha_t \alpha_t^\dagger x}{x^\dagger \sigma_t \sigma_t^\dagger x} = \frac{\left(\alpha_t^{\mathrm{Corp}}\right)^2 \left(x^{\mathrm{Corp}}\right)^2}{\sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}} \sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}\,\dagger} \left(x^{\mathrm{Corp}}\right)^2} = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}^2\left(\sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}\,\dagger} \sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}}\right)}{4\sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}} \sigma_t^{\mathrm{Corp}\,\dagger}} = \\ = t^2 \left(\frac{\mathcal{D}(J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t))}{1 - J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t)}\right)^2 \frac{\mathrm{Tr}^2\left(\left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-1}\right)}{W_t^\dagger \left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-2} W_t}. \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Let us compute following Nelson mean derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, X_t)) &= J_\varepsilon * (\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{LGD}_t) X_t + \mathrm{LGD}_t\, \mathcal{D}(X_t)) = \\ &= J_\varepsilon * (\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{LGD}_t)\Theta(t-\tau) + \mathrm{LGD}_t\, \delta(t-\tau)), \\ \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{LGD}_t) &= \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{LGD}_\tau\, \Theta(t-\tau)) = \mathrm{LGD}_\tau\, \delta(t-\tau). \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

Thereby Θ denotes Heavyside's function and δ Dirac's delta generalized function in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbf{R})$. The Sharpe ratio becomes then

$$\left(\frac{\alpha_t^x}{|\sigma_t^x|}\right)^2 = \frac{4t^2 (J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2 \delta(t-\tau)}{(1 - (J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_t\, \Theta(t-\tau)))^2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}^2\left(\left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-1}\right)}{W_t^\dagger \left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-2} W_t}, \tag{92}$$

and its integral for $T \to +\infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\alpha_t^x}{|\sigma_t^x|}\right)^2 dt = \\
&= \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{2t^2 (J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2 \delta(t-\tau)}{(1 - J_\varepsilon * (\mathrm{LGD}_t\, \Theta(t-\tau)))^2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}^2\left(\left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-1}\right)}{W_t^\dagger \left(W_t W_t^\dagger\right)^{-2} W_t} dt = \\
&= \frac{4\tau^2 (J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2}{(2 - J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}^2\left(\left(W_\tau {W_\tau}^\dagger\right)^{-1}\right)}{{W_\tau}^\dagger \left(W_\tau {W_\tau}^\dagger\right)^{-2} W_\tau} = \\
&= \frac{4\tau^2 (J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2}{(2 - J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)^2} \frac{1}{W_\tau^\dagger W_\tau} = \left(\frac{2\tau J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{(2 - J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau)\sqrt{W_\tau^\dagger W_\tau}}\right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

The Novikov condition reads therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_0\left[\exp\left(\left(\frac{2J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{2 - J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau} \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{W_\tau^\dagger W_\tau}}\right)^2\right)\right] < +\infty. \tag{94}$$

Now, the expression

$$\frac{2J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{2 - J_\varepsilon * \mathrm{LGD}_\tau} \to \frac{2\,\mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{2 - \mathrm{LGD}_\tau} \quad (\varepsilon \to 0^+) \tag{95}$$

and is bounded in ε. Therefore, after having inserted the definition of $Q_t^2(K)$, inequality (80) follows and the proof is completed.

□

What form can be assumed by the Novikov condition?

Corollary 42. *Under the independence assumption among Loss-Given-Default, default and asset value dynamics the Novikov condition for the intensity credit model becomes*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2^{\frac{K}{2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{K}{2}\right)} \int_{[0,1]\times[0,+\infty[^2} d^3(l,t,q) \left\{\rho_{LGD_t}(l)\mathbf{E}_0\left[\lambda_t \exp\left(-\int_0^t dh\lambda_h\right)\right]\cdot\right. \\
&\left.\cdot \exp\left(\left(\frac{K}{2} - 1\right)\log(q) - \frac{q}{2}\left(\frac{2l}{2-l}\right)^2 \frac{t}{q}\right)\right\} < +\infty
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Proof. It suffices to write the expectation in formula (80) as integral over the range of Loss-Given-Default, Time-To-Default and $Q_t^2(K)$ using the joint density, which, by assumption, can be written as product of the marginal densities. Inserting the density of the chi-squared distribution proves the corollary.

□

Remark 43. *The independence assumption is rather strong and not particularly realistic, since -on the basis of empirical observations (cf. [AlReSi01] and [AlBrReSi05])- one expects (positive) correlations between defaults and Loss-Given-Defaults. This behaviour has been captured in a structural model context in [FaSh12], where a generalized Merton default model is extended to account for stochastic* LGD_t *with given correlations with the company asset value process* E_t*.*

A better result is the following

Corollary 44. *Novikov's condition for reduced credit risk models reads*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{[0,1]\times[0,+\infty[^2} d^3(l,t,q)\left\{\mathbb{E}_0\left[\lambda_t \exp\left(-\int_0^t dh\lambda_h\right)\right]\cdot\right.\\ \left.\cdot\mathbb{P}_0[\mathrm{LGD}_t = l, Q_t^2(K) = q]\exp\left(\left(\frac{2l}{2-l}\right)^2\frac{t}{q}\right)\right\} < +\infty\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Proof. Novikov's condition can be developed as

$$\begin{aligned}+\infty &> \mathbb{E}_0\left[\exp\left(\left(\frac{2\,\mathrm{LGD}_\tau}{2-\mathrm{LGD}_\tau}\right)^2\frac{\tau}{Q_\tau^2(K)}\right)\right] = \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty}\rho_\tau(t)\mathbb{E}_0\left[\exp\left(\left(\frac{2\,\mathrm{LGD}_t}{2-\mathrm{LGD}_t}\right)^2\frac{t}{Q_\tau^2(K)}\right)\right] = \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty}\left\{\mathbb{E}_0\left[\lambda_t\exp\left(-\int_0^t dh\lambda_h\right)\right]\cdot\right. \\ &\left.\cdot\int_0^1 dl\int_0^{+\infty}dq\exp\left(\left(\frac{2l}{2-l}\right)^2\frac{t}{q}\right)\rho_{(\mathrm{LGD}_t,Q_t^2(K))}(l,q)\right\} = \\ &= \int_{[0,1]\times[0,+\infty[^2} d^3(l,t,q)\left\{\mathbb{E}_0\left[\lambda_t\exp\left(-\int_0^t dh\lambda_h\right)\right]\cdot\right. \\ &\left.\cdot\exp\left(\left(\frac{2l}{2-l}\right)^2\frac{t}{q}\right)\mathbb{P}_0[\mathrm{LGD}_t = l, Q_t^2(K) = q]\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

which proves the statement.

□

4 Conclusion

By introducing an appropriate stochastic differential geometric formalism the classical theory of stochastic finance can be embedded into a conceptual framework called Geometric Arbitrage Theory, where the market is modelled with a principal fibre bundle and arbitrage corresponds to its curvature. The tools developed can be applied to default risk and recovery modeling leading to no arbitrage characterizations for credit markets.

A Derivatives of Stochastic Processes

In stochastic differential geometry one would like to lift the constructions of stochastic analysis from open subsets of $\mathbf{R}^N$ to N dimensional differentiable manifolds. To that aim, chart invariant definitions are needed and hence a stochastic calculus satisfying the usual chain rule and not Itô's Lemma is required, (cf. [HaTh94], Chapter 7, and the remark in Chapter 4 at the beginning of page 200). That is why we will be mainly concerned in this paper by stochastic integrals and derivatives meant in *Stratonovich*'s sense and not in *Itô*'s.

Definition 45. *Let I be a real interval and $Q = (Q_t)_{t\in I}$ be a vector valued stochastic process on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$. The process Q determines three families of σ-subalgebras of the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$:*

(i) "Past" $\mathcal{P}_t$, generated by the preimages of Borel sets in $\mathbf{R}^N$ by all mappings $Q_s : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$ for $0 < s < t$.

(ii) "Future" $\mathcal{F}_t$, generated by the preimages of Borel sets in $\mathbf{R}^N$ by all mappings $Q_s : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$ for $0 < t < s$.

(iii) "Present" $\mathcal{N}_t$, generated by the preimages of Borel sets in $\mathbf{R}^N$ by the mapping $Q_s : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}^N$.

Let $Q = (Q_t)_{t\in I}$ be continuous. Assuming that the following limits exist, ***Nelson's stochastic derivatives*** *are defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} DQ_t &:= \lim_{h\to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Q_{t+h} - Q_t}{h}\middle|\mathcal{P}_t\right] : \textit{forward derivative,} \\ D_*Q_t &:= \lim_{h\to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Q_t - Q_{t-h}}{h}\middle|\mathcal{F}_t\right] : \textit{backward derivative,} \\ \mathcal{D}Q_t &:= \frac{DQ_t + D_*Q_t}{2} : \textit{mean derivative.} \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^1(I)$ the set of all processes Q such that $t \mapsto Q_t$, $t \mapsto DQ_t$ and $t \mapsto D_*Q_t$ are continuous mappings from I to $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$. Let $\mathcal{C}^1(I)$ the completion of $\mathcal{S}^1(I)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|Q\| := \sup_{t\in I} \left(\|Q_t\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{A})} + \|DQ_t\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{A})} + \|D_*Q_t\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{A})}\right). \tag{100}$$

Remark 46. *The stochastic derivatives D, D_* and $\mathcal{D}$ correspond to Itô's, to the anticipative and, respectively, to Stratonovich's integral (cf. [Gl11]). The process space $\mathcal{C}^1(I)$ contains all Itô processes. If Q is a Markov process, then the sigma algebras $\mathcal{P}_t$ ("past") and $\mathcal{F}_t$ ("future") in the definitions of forward and backward derivatives can be substituted by the sigma algebra $\mathcal{N}_t$ ("present"), see Chapter 6.1 and 8.1 in ([Gl11]).*

Stochastic derivatives can be defined pointwise in $\omega \in \Omega$ outside the class $\mathcal{C}^1$ in terms of generalized functions.

Definition 47. *Let $Q : I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous linear functional in the test processes $\varphi : I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ for $\varphi(\omega) \in C_c^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$.* ***Nelson's generalized stochastic derivatives:***

$$\begin{aligned} &DQ(\varphi_t) := -Q(D\varphi_t)\text{: forward generalized derivative,} \\ &D_*Q(\varphi_t) := -Q(D^*\varphi_t)\text{: backward generalized derivative,} \\ &\mathcal{D}(\varphi_t) := -Q(\mathcal{D}\varphi_t)\text{: mean generalized derivative.} \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

If the generalized derivative is regular, then the process has a derivative in the classic sense.

References

[AlReSi01] E.I. ALTMAN, A. RESTI and A. SIRONI, *Analyzing and Explaining Default Recovery Rates*, The International Swaps & Derivatives Association, 2001.

[AlBrReSi05] E.I. ALTMAN, B. BRADY, A. RESTI and A. SIRONI, *The Link between Default and Recovery Rates: Theory, Empirical Evidence, and Implications*, Journal of Business, Vol. 78, No. 62005, 2005.

[BjHu05] T. BJÖRK and H. HULT, *A Note on Wick Products and the Fractional Black-Scholes Model*, Finance & Stochastics, **9**, No.2, (197-209), 2005.

[Bl81] D. BLEECKER, *Gauge Theory and Variational Principles*, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1981, (republished by Dover 2005).

[DeSc08] F. DELBAEN and W. SCHACHERMAYER, *The Mathematics of Arbitrage*, Springer 2008.

[DuFiMu00] B. DUPOYET, H. R. FIEBIG and D. P. MUSGROV, *Gauge Invariant Lattice Quantum Field Theory: Implications for Statistical Properties of High Frequency Financial Markets*, Physica A **389** (107-116), 2010.

[DeMe80] C. DELLACHÉRIE and P. A. MEYER, *Probabilité et potentiel II - Théorie des martingales - Chapitres 5 à 8*, Hermann, 1980.

[El82] K. D. ELWORTHY, *Stochastic Differential Equations on Manifolds*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, 1982.

[Em89] M. EMÉRY, *Stochastic Calculus on Manifolds-With an Appendix by P. A. Meyer*, Springer, 1989.

[FaSh12] S. FARINELLI and M. SHKOLNIKOV, *Two Models of Stochastic Loss Given Default*, The Journal of Credit Risk, Vol. 8, No. 2, (320), Summer 2012.

[Fa14] S. FARINELLI, *Geometric Arbitrage Theory and Market Dynamics*, accepted upon revisions by Journal of Geometric Mechanics, arXiv:0910.1671v4.

[FeJi07] M. FEI-TE and M. JIN-LONG, *Solitary Wave Solutions of Nonlinear Financial Markets: Data-Modeling-Concept-Practicing*, Front. Phys. China, **2(3)**,(368-374), 2007.

[FlHu96] B. FLESAKER and L. HUGHSTON, *Positive Interest*, Risk **9 (1)**, (46-40), 1996.

[FrSc11] R. FREY and T. SCHMIDT, *Filtering and Incomplete Information in Credit Risk*, Chapter 7 in Recent Advancements in the Theory and Practice of Credit Derivatives, Damiano Brigo, Tom Bielecki and Frederic Patras, ed., Wiley, 2011.

[Gl11] Y. E. GLIKLIKH, *Global and Stochastic Analysis with Applications to Mathematical Physics*, Theoretical and Mathemtical Physics, Springer, 2010.

[HaTh94] W. HACKENBROCH and A. THALMAIER, *Stochastische Analysis. Eine Einführung in die Theorie der stetigen Semimartingale*, Teubner Verlag, 1994.

[Ho03] L. HORMÄNDER, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I: Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*, Springer, 2003.

[Hs02] E. P. HSU, *Stochastic Analysis on Manifolds*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **38**, AMS, 2002.

[HuKe04] P. J. HUNT and J. E. KENNEDY, *Financial Derivatives in Theory and Practice*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, 2004.

[Il00] K. ILINSKI, *Gauge Geometry of Financial Markets*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, (L5L14), 2000.

[Il01] K. ILINSKI, *Physics of Finance: Gauge Modelling in Non-Equilibrium Pricing*, Wiley, 2001.

[JaPr04] R. A. JARROW and Ph. PROTTER *Structural versus Reduced Form Models: A New Information Based Perspective*, Journal of Investment Management, Vol. 2, No. 2, (1-10), 2004.

[Ma96] P. N. MALANEY, *The Index Number Problem: A Differential Geometric Approach*, PhD Thesis, Harvard University Economics Department, 1996.

[Mo09] Y. MORISAWA, *Toward a Geometric Formulation of Triangular Arbitrage: An Introduction to Gauge Theory of Arbitrage*, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement **179**, (209-214), 2009.

[Schö00] Ph. J. SCHÖNBUCHER, *Credit Risk Modelling and Credit Derivatives*, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors der Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftswissenschaften durch die Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 2000.

[Schw80] L. SCHWARTZ, *Semi-martingales sur des variétés et martingales conformes sur des variétés analytiques complexes*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1980.

[SmSp98] A. SMITH and C. SPEED, *Gauge Transforms in Stochastic Investment*, Proceedings of the 1998 AFIR Colloquim, Cambridge, England, 1998.

[St00] D. W. STROOCK, *An Introduction to the Analysis of Paths on a Riemannian Manifold*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **74**, AMS, 2000.

[We06] E. WEINSTEIN, *Gauge Theory and Inflation: Enlarging the Wu-Yang Dictionary to a unifying Rosetta Stone for Geometry in Application*, Talk given at Perimeter Institute, 2006. Available online at: http://pirsa.org/06050010/, 2006.

[Yo99] K. YOUNG, *Foreign Exchange Market as a Lattice Gauge Theory*, Am. J. Phys. **67**, 1999.